

Serial No 09/470,042

In reply to Office Action mailed September 13, 2004

Page 8 of 9

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 19-24, 26-35, 37-46, and 48-51 are pending in this application. Claims 19, 30, and 41 have been amended, and claims 25, 36, and 47 have been canceled. The amendments are fully supported by the specification. Moreover, the amendments merely move subject matter from previous claims 25, 36, and 47 into their respective independent claims from which they depended. For at least the reasons stated below, Applicants assert that all claims are in condition for allowance.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 19-24, 26-35, 37-46, and 48-51 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartheimer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,305,200), in view of Ginter et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,185,683). The cited references, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations as required by MPEP § 2143. Therefore, this rejection is unsupported by the art, and Applicants respectfully request that Examiner withdraw the rejection.

In the last Office Action, Examiner indicated that claims 25, 36, and 47 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Independent claims 19, 30, and 41 have been so amended, incorporating the subject matter of claims 25, 36, and 47 respectively. Accordingly, Applicants assert that independent claims 19, 30, and 41, and each of the dependent claims thereto, are in condition for allowance.

Applicants further maintain that even without such claim amendments, independent claims 19, 30, and 41 would be allowable over *Hartheimer* and *Ginter*, because these references fail to teach or suggest every element of every claim. Specifically, the references fail to teach or suggest at least (1) generating an electronic form, including a combined purchase order proforma invoice, an electronic transportation document, and an electronic shipping document, and (2) performing a compliance check. Similarly, Applicants maintain that even without such amendment, claims 26, 37, and 48 would be allowable over the cited references because they fail to teach or suggest filtering the form's trade terms and outputting the form with only the trade terms. These arguments are set forth in more detail in the Amendment filed April 20, 2004, and are hereby incorporated by reference.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully request that a Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (612) 607-7386. If any fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, then the Commissioner is authorized to

Serial No 09/470,042


In reply to Office Action mailed September 13, 2004

Page 9 of 9

charge such fees including fees for any extension of time, to Deposit Account No. 50-1901
(Reference 60021-340001).

Respectfully submitted,

By



Christopher R. Hilberg, Reg. No. 48,740
Customer No. 29838

Oppenheimer Wolff & Donnelly, LLP
45 South Seventh St.
Plaza VII, Suite 3300
Minneapolis, MN 55402-1609
Telephone: 612-607-7386
Facsimile: 612-607-7100
E-mail: CHilberg@oppenheimer.com